

FILED - GR

March 22, 2016 10:07 AM

Cheryl Marie and Michael Patrick: Lynch
c/o 19409 US 12, New Buffalo, MI 49117
269-815-8776; mpandcm@gmail.com

CLERK OF COURT
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
BY: clp SCANNED BY: clp 3/22

Clerk of Court
United States District Court for Western Michigan
110 Michigan NW, Grand Rapids, MI 49503

March 21, 2016

Notice and Request for correction of serious clerical mistakes of fact

Dear Clerk Dorwin,

We have viewed, via PACER, that you established Case No. 1:16-cv-00282-RJJ-PJG last Friday (the 18th), noting also that you have deposited our \$400 filing money and have sent us a copy of the Receipt of Case Notice via U.S. Mail. Per your other notations showing on the online Docket report, there are some clerical mistakes of fact pertaining to the “Nature of Suit” and the “Cause”. We also see that the style of the case showing on the docket differs from the way it appears on the Notice of the case. The PACER printout is attached.

This notice and request alerts you as to what corrections must be made so that your report presents our suit in accordance with the content of our Complaint and other initiating documentation. Please find enclosed with this notice, two copies of our **Civil Cover Sheet – Amended** (bearing no substantive changes from the original), plus a full copy of this notice as an Information for the assigned judge and magistrate.

We request that the following corrections be made as soon as possible:

1. Style of the case. The style on the Notice of the case shows what we had expected – CHERYL MARIE, et al., v. BRET WITKOWSKI. But the docket report shows “Marie et al v. Witkowski”. To cause continuity, we consent to your hyphenating of “Cheryl Marie” into a single designation. That style, then, should be: Cheryl-Marie et al v. Witkowski. The “Marie et al” is unknown to the defendant, and to the public record, with respect to the nature and cause of our suit.
2. Nature of Suit: 950 (Constitutionality of State Statutes). This misrepresents the nature. We apologize for not initially making clear that none of the numerated categories is sufficient to correctly identify the nature of our suit. Our amended Civil Cover Sheet clarifies that per our use of “NA” written into each box and our addition of the default category: “Other”. We had presumed that such default designation would be indicated by the clerk. Our suit has nothing to do with any statute or code, as is expressed in our Complaint at paragraph 33. As we further express, specifically at paragraphs 12, 32 and 58, there is no conflict between The

Organic Laws of the United States of America of concern to us as to the State statute being of concern to the defendant. The point of our complaint is that there is no law that authorizes the defendant's actions against us. We are suing the defendant personally (not in his official capacity) under the laws of his domicile (i.e., State of Michigan), in which involuntary servitude is outlawed. The Nature of Suit should be corrected to: Other.

3. Cause: 28:1332 Diversity – Torts to Land. To clarify, that code only applies to the Court's internal recognition of constitutional diversity of citizenship as to the complete diversity of chosen law-jurisdictions (law of the place) wherein We choose to live/domicile separately from wherein the defendant chooses to domicile for exercising self-obligations. The diversity of jurisdiction we are claiming arises directly from Article III, Section 2 of the 1787 Constitution for the United States of America, NOT from 28:1332 (which code only regards federal "States", not states of the Union). In our Complaint, at paragraph 4, we state that the presiding judge has Art III power to hear the previously-described complete diversity of law-jurisdictions between us and the defendant. That is why our Civil Cover Sheet references that the laws applicable to this cause are: "The Organic Laws of the United States of America" (as found at the beginning of the U. S. Code Vol. One). The Cause should be: Article III Section 2, 1787 Constitution Diversity – Tort of Involuntary Servitude.

4. Of additional concern to us is that the docket report shows "RESTRICTED FILER" above Co-plaintiff Michael Patrick's appellation. We do not know how or why (the basis in fact and law). We feel the designation prejudices our suit. It casts our good character and suit in a false light. The defendant and the public may assume that our filings are already judged by the Court's officers as having some sort of negating quality. The docket report should not show that false-characterization.

5. Further case-initiating matters. We are not certain about **which courthouse** the case will be heard within. We choose the Kalamazoo location, and likely the defendant would prefer the closer location. Please provide us that certainty. We also seek acknowledgment that we can **access the courthouse with use of our photo-identification** provided as colored Exhibits to the *Ex Parte Document: Suit Initiating Matters* referenced in the docket text as "Attachment 1 (#8)". **Note:** That document should noted more accurately, as for instance: "#8 Ex Parte Coordinating Matters with Exhibits A-D".

Thank you for your timely consideration of the foregoing.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Marie : seal.

Michael Patrick: seal.

Cheryl Marie and Michael Patrick